



STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

128-10th Avenue SW • P.O. Box 42525 • Olympia, Washington 98504-2525
(360) 725-2966 • fax (360) 586-9383 • e-mail sbcc@cted.wa.gov • www.sbcc.wa.gov

MINUTES WASHINGTON STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL

Date: June 11, 2010

Location: Shoreline City Hall, City Council Chambers

Council Members Present: John Cochran, Council Chair; Ray Allshouse; Rod Bault; John Chelminiak; David DeWitte; Mari Hamasaki; Angie Homola; Robert Koch; Mark Kulaas; Jerry Mueller; David Peden; Tien Peng; and Dale Wentworth; Timm Ormsby

Council Members Absent: Kristyn Clayton, Dave Kokot

Visitors Present: Darrick Philp, David Cohan, Ed Golden, Roger Rocket, Pete Crow, Collin Smith, Paul O'Connor, Willie Hill, Dave Cantrell, Chuck Murray, Jeff D'Amelin, Kevin Cox, Spark Carlander, Kraig Stevenson, Jason R. Burge, Diane Glenn, Jeff Holgate, Tom Kinsman, Dave Hawkes, Daimon Doyle, Kate Tate, Theresa Neal, Tom Bell, Eric Lohnes, Kim Drury, Lee Kranz, Garrett Huffman, Tom Nichols, Maureen Traxler, Chris McKinney

Staff Present: Tim Nogler, Krista Braaksma, Joanne McCaughan, Peggy Bryden

Attorney Generals Office Staff Present: Sandra Adix, Mary Ellen Combo, Ann Essko

CALL TO ORDER

John Cochran, Council Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Ray Allshouse welcomed everyone to the new Shoreline City Hall and introductions were made. John thanked the City of Shoreline for hosting the meeting today. Sandra Adix stated that Mary Ellen Combo would be taking over the position as Council legal representation.

REVIEW AND APPROVE AGENDA, MINUTES

The Agenda was amended as follows. Item 11, Possible Executive Session for Consideration of Personnel Issues & Legal Concerns was moved to follow Item 4. Mari Hamasaki proposed that, in light of upcoming action, it might be prudent to table the energy code interpretations for the time being.

Motion #1:

Mari Hamasaki moved to table the Energy Code Interpretations. Ray seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The agenda was approved as amended.

The minutes of the April 9, 2010 meeting were approved with the addition of including John Chelminiak in the Council members attending list as he had participated by telephone

March 12 meeting minutes were tabled at an earlier meeting due to an issue regarding a quote by Kraig Stevenson. The staff reviewed the tapes and the statement was correct as noted in the February minutes, and the minutes were approved

PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

John Cochran invited those who had signed up to speak to come forward and informed these nine individuals that they each have two minutes to speak due to the length of the agenda.

Ed Golden, Agility Restoration Services. Golden had submitted a proposal re: permanent roof anchors; he thanked the council for what they have done so far. He was taken aback by the emergency rulemaking proposal as it didn't seem to address the issue. He offered his services to forward with the BIAW, Labor & Industries and the Code Council to try and get clearer language. He shared pictures with Council showing what contractors deal with and the money spent annually due to falls. He is available during and after the meeting to discuss this further.

Derek Philp, BelRed Energy Solutions. Energy Code spoke on the duct retrofit issue. The company is 100% residential HVAC company and supports the goal of energy savings; that is their focus. He fully supports the Governor's request for delay of the implementation of the new energy code; he believes it would have a debilitating impact on the construction trades, especially the HVAC contractors. Over the past year they have seen the replacement of parts through their service department increase by 40% while installations have decreased by 15%, due to economic conditions. More people choose to repair than replace furnaces and equipment. He estimated those numbers will double. He firmly believes that the duct sealing related to replacement of the HVAC systems will have the reverse effect than what is being achieved with the energy savings.

David Cohen, NW Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA). Thanks for the opportunity to speak. NEEA is funded by Puget Sound Energy, Seattle City Light and other utilities. It is by far the largest supplier of energy code training in Washington. They have spent \$200,000 on training thus far on the 2009 Energy Code as approved in November 2009. The Council should consider the Governor's letter, but also consider there has been great investment made on the both training and compliance materials for this new code.

He is asking Council to consider three things:

1. Consider moving the date back from April 2011 to January of 2011 to get a full construction season where you don't have to put the new code in. If the wait is until April of 2011 then all permits will be submitted at the end under the old code thereby losing two construction seasons and the associated energy savings with those.
2. This January date doesn't stop you from reconsidering the date after January and extending it. Council needs to consider impact on code cycle. How will this affect the implementing of the next code cycle?
3. Finally, my understanding is that this is largely driven by the residential stakeholders. So please consider not delaying the entire code, only the residential side of the code. Thank you.

Colin Smith, Sheet Metal Workers Local 66. He is in favor of the existing 2009 code as it has been modified. He would encourage council to continue to move this code forward. In light of energy savings, all residential contractors are moving on with retrofitting and upgrading their residential equipment. The commercial side is doing this also. Duct sealing has been ongoing for a number of years on the commercial side. It works. The residential industry has been left out there alone to do whatever its stakeholders dictate. This modification is needed. The research has been done and the residential industry is one of the most wasteful energy sources in the state. Thank you.

Tom Nichols declined to address the Council at this time.

Craig Williamson, owner of HVAC company MM Comfort Systems, since 1977 stated he would like to speak to the duct testing and sealing for existing residential buildings; there is an array of unintended consequences. Those consequences include a significant additional cost to consumers for items such as covering diffusers in a home, doing a pressure test, getting a furnace installation, etc. The labor costs alone, for duct testing done perfectly, are more than the original cost to do the original furnace installation. Because the consumers are going to experience increased costs they are going to attempt repair of old, inefficient equipment rather than replacement with more efficient equipment. We will see an increase in energy costs if this code is adopted as opposed to the proposed decrease. Additionally it prevents a normal contract from taking place between a homeowner and a contractor because it is impossible for the contractor to know what the costs are to comply. Many customers are also sensitive about privacy issues; contractors are expected to search every room to access the air diffusers and customer will not give us permission to enter these private spaces. In conclusion we will see an increase in underground contracting as customers that have to replace equipment are forced to find cheaper alternatives. Thank you.

Mike Frickberg, Washington State HVACR Association. He has concerns about what's best for the consumer and what's best for the State of Washington. One can argue the benefits of doing duct sealing and he supports this because it is something very viable. Their company is very in tune with and supports energy conservation. This implementation will create difficulties not intended. The Washington State HVACR Association and the contractors statewide support the

Governor's request to delay the implementation of this to be sure we are doing the "right things." He agrees they need to find ways to reduce the energy, but how do we go about it? Do we make it a homeowners' issue or the contractors' issue; thereby enhance the underground economy and reduce the sales tax to the cities because it's being done "under the table." We'd rather do it "above the table" and do it right. We need better approaches. Thank you.

Daimon Doyle, a homebuilder from Olympia; has been in the industry for 20 years. He is an accredited Energy Star verifier, a PTCS contractor and part of the certified Green Professional Program. The industry is in a tough time and this last minute change in direction is going to have a significant impact on his revenue. I am here to support the Governor's request and urge the Council to do so. Green building and energy efficiency are good things as are other things, but they are not mandated. The biggest concern from a builder's perspective is the additional cost that won't be recognized by lenders and appraisers. Many appraisals today are coming in at less than the cost of building the project. So until the market stabilizes and home prices level off, he doesn't believe they can manage this added increase in cost. Please consider the Governor's request and hopefully in the next nine months we will see some stabilization in our market. Thank you.

Jeff Holgate, Washington Energy Services, and in business in the area since 1957. He can't add to testimony already presented regarding the additional cost to the retrofit industry, but is here to encourage the Council to act on the Governor's letter to postpone this implementation until April until the proper economic impact studies can be done on the retrofit side of the business request. He believes there will be some unintended expense to the consumer that no one had thought about, so is here to support the Governor's letter.

Kim Drury, representing NW Energy Coalition and the Washington Environmental Council. We ask that the Council not act on the Governor's request and respect the long and intensive process that they, along with many stakeholders, invested in adopting the code. This new code will accelerate rather than harm economic recovery. All Washington residents will benefit from money that would have gone to pay higher energy bills remaining in local communities creating jobs. Washington families benefit from lower energy bills making home ownership more affordable. That money can be spent locally instead of spending it for utilities. Just six months ago the Governor sent a letter to legislators and copied the Council. In that letter she noted that the adopted code will serve the best interest of citizens of the state. She was pleased with it and quoted the legislature's finding that the more energy efficient buildings will save money, create jobs, enhance energy security, and speed economic recovery. We urge the Council, with all due respect, to not act on the Governor's request and allow the code to go forward. It is in the best interest of our economy. Thank you.

Kraig Stevenson, representing International Code Council (ICC), urged the Council to find common ground on things not in contention; things that are not under controversy. The council can decide any course of action and modify the proposal; a process that better fulfills the adoption of energy codes. You have a table of ICC adoption proposal, which you could move forward with energy code efficiencies. On another issue related to process. I encourage the council to look at RCW 19.27A, Section 150. In that statute it says the department, meaning the Dept. of Commerce, and the Council shall convene a workgroup with the affected parties. I've been told many of the affected parties are just now learning about the process that has been

underway. I encourage the Council to provide guidance and don't, by inaction, delegate the control over what will come back to you in a strategic report. The Council should take a look at what was a draft, a process proposed by John Cochran, and look at how that can improve the process in both issues.

Maureen Traxler, City of Seattle. We didn't have a lot of time to prepare testimony, but are in general agreement with comments made by Kim Drury. She read a letter from the head of Planning and Development, City of Seattle, supporting, the July 1, 2010 date of adoption of the Washington State Energy Code. Opposing this does not serve the best interest of the citizens of the State. This is not a "jobs versus energy" trade-off since the new energy measures can create new jobs. She encouraged the Council to continue on the normal adoption schedule and not delay implementation; if a delay is necessary it should be for no longer than requested by Governor Gregoire. There is, however, a discrepancy in the Governor's letter which I would point out that if you do delay for nine months the new code provisions will apply in the 2011 construction season. Our experience is that most of the permits for the 2011 construction season will already have been submitted by the April 1 of next year. Thank you.

Jeff Demillia, Olson Energy Service & Gas Appliance Service. I would like to encourage the council to adopt the Governor's proposal for delay. Not because anybody in the retrofit industry doesn't agree with the need to enhance energy savings. However, we need to make sure when we do this we are accomplishing what we want to. We strongly believe that as it is today, we are going to force consumers to buy less efficient equipment from lesser contracting firms that aren't interested in the end result. Any savings now is going to be offset by people going to firms that are not doing the quality job that needs to be done. Thank you.

Garrett Huffman, Master Builders of King & Snohomish counties. We have met with the Governor for the past five months. You have three interpretations before you today: blower door testing, blower door sampling and the lighting. We strongly encourage you to adopt each of those and also the Governor's letter that arrived earlier this week. We did meet with the Governor for five months and did go over many economic situations. Encourage you to act on her letter and I realize that it didn't come lightly. Thank you.

The Council recessed into Executive Session at 10:35 a.m. in accordance with RCW 42.30.110.1i, to discuss with the Attorney General's office representing the Council pending litigation in which the State Building Code Council is a party. The Executive Session is scheduled for 30 minutes and will conclude at 11:05 a.m. The Council plans to reconvene in an Open Session.

The Council reconvened at 11:15 a.m.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mechanical, Ventilation and Energy Codes Committee

Mari Hamasaki reported on yesterday's meeting where public comments were received. Mr. Williamson, who also reported today, has submitted an amendment regarding the duct testing to be presented to Council at a later date. Regarding the Energy Code Strategic Plan Workgroup,

Chuck Murray, of Commerce, gave an update. This was discussed at the last meeting and, in summary, there have been two webinars to date. Chuck has scheduled weekly webinars and there is also a monthly workgroup session. These scheduled workgroups have a link under the SBCC website. Chuck pointed out the list of topics on the website and indicated any participation is welcome. Any comments by e-mail are also welcome. The last workgroup session, which took place yesterday, covered aspiration codes. Comments received are as follows. First was to consider identifying the aspiration codes as part of an appendix to the Energy Code. The second comment was to consider aspiration codes actually referencing existing programs. A final comment from John Cochran suggested perhaps having an aspirational code TAG to review aspirational codes that could be recommended as part of the building codes. As Jerry Mueller is the representative to the workgroup on behalf of the Council, a line item is to be added to next council agendas for Jerry to update the Council on their activities. You should have a packet of this information. Of note, because of speakers availability, Financial Mechanisms and the Costs Benefits has been flipped. So Financial Mechanisms is scheduled for the 29th and the Costs Benefits is scheduled for Tuesday 22nd. Tim indicates that we have had great participation in this, and the more input we can get the more value this will add to the workgroup.

Motion #1

Mari Hamasaki moved approval of the workplan for the workgroup. John Cochran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The next item discussed about was the Mechanical TAG. Two proposed amendments were presented; IMC-01 and IMC-02. The first amendment, IMC-1, the Council received a proposal from Lee Kranz. For IMC-2 the Committee does recommend following the Plumbing Code's recommendation to disapprove the amendment and is bringing IMC-2 forward to the Council with that recommendation. There was no recommendation for IMC-1 and it can be discussed further if needed under the TAG report.

At the beginning of this year monthly Committee meetings for the MVE were established in light of the strategic workgroup. However, it was determined a meeting was not needed in July.

Executive Committee

John Cochran reported the Committee met on April 15 by teleconference. Tim briefed the Committee on bylaw changes necessary to implement new procedure for amendment process. Each member was going to think about who should be represented on TAGs. There has not been a follow-up meeting to this discussion to date.

Tim added that the next step is the full Council considering changes to bylaws. We will be seeing something in the September packet on amending bylaws. The goal is to have the new process in place by the end of the year to then appoint TAGs and the new committee in preparation for the 2011 code cycle.

TAG REPORTS

Building Code TAG

John Cochran reported the TAG had three proposals. One was Log #10-12, proposed by Tom Phillips on 5 story wood framed buildings. The TAG recommended modifications, which would be for occupancies R-1 and R-2 and would allow for three stories in Type 5-A construction. Section 504.2 allows for one additional story if the building is sprinkled. The proposal recommended to the Council is to allow a fifth story if the interior exit stairs and ramps are pressurized. The TAG recommends Council approval.

Motion #2

Motion was made on the five story wood frame issue to follow the TAG's recommendation. Motion passed unanimously.

Tim clarified this would go into regular rulemaking this year. The steps being: going to public hearings, final decision, keeping it on the regular cycle, making it effective with the 2012 code in 2013. The Council can make that decision after a public hearing process. John noted it was a unanimous vote at the TAG.

The second item, Log 10-11 was a proposal by Ed Golden and pertains to requirements for roof anchors. There is a similar proposal for the IRC TAG. The TAG voted to deny this. This would require roof access safety mechanisms on all buildings with an inclined roof. The Building, Fire, Plumbing Code Committee recommended emergency approval of the requirement and sent the proposal to the building Code TAG for technical review. We reviewed it in the meeting and chose to deny it. The TAG felt it was more of something to be regulated by the Dept. of Labor and Industries (L&I). Tim was going to assist in doing more research on that. We had a presentation from the proponent on roof safety mechanisms. Tim noted the TAG felt this was in accordance with L&I rules already set forth for worker safety. The proposal is to codify it in building code as a permanent system. The BFP Committee felt it was important and necessary. The TAG saw problems with the language, no clear scope or definitions. The TAG recommends clarifications of how it would work with L&I regulations. We are now looking for direction from Council on how to move forward.

Angie asked for clarification of timeline. Tim responds that there is a March 1 deadline for every year of the code development. This means the goal would be to have something by March 1 of next year where we would consider this issue. Ray Allhouse would also like to include a residential component to this because as a result of the discussion that ensued, we never really addressed it as part of the IRC TAG. Please add this to the motion to add this to the IBC and the IRC work plans.

Motion #3

Ray Allshouse made a friendly amendment, accepted by Mari Hamasaki and Angie Homola to include a residential proposal. The motion carried unanimously.

John Cochran reported the other issue involved an emergency rule regarding Section 1005, which pertains to egress width. The 2009 code took away the occupant load factor upon which exit widths are calculated for sprinklered buildings. The effect that this has on the 2009 code is essentially all exits got 50 percent wider. In the hearings in Dallas, this changed and essentially returning to the 2006 language which allows the exception for sprinklered buildings and gives a decreased math factor for calculating the egress width, with the added provision that there be voice alarm communication systems. So the 2012 code will reflect this language and the AIA, is unanimously endorsing the change back to the 2006 edition because all the buildings that are in design now would be effected by this issue. More importantly in the long run if the 2009 code is allowed to proceed unamended you would have a “family” of buildings with an inconsistent egress width. The TAG thereby unanimously recommends this as an emergency rule so that it could go into effect right away.

Motion #4:

Mark Kulaas moved to enter into the Emergency rulemaking on egress width. John Chelminiak seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously after discussion described below.

Angie asked for clarification on the alarm system requirement. John Cochran responded that if you add voice communication for firefighters to direct occupants in the building, they were fine with the reduced width in the exits. Tim adds that this was considered by the ICC and considered to be sufficient. This will be in the 2012 code.

Tim noted this was on the agenda as item 7.

Residential Code TAG

Ray Allshouse reported the TAG was forwarded 9 proposals. Two were tabled prior to the first TAG meeting; these two being labeled IRC -8 and IRC-9. Two other items, IRC-6 and IRC-7, were also tabled and will be resubmitted at a later date. IRC-1 was withdrawn by the proponent. This left IRC- 2, IRC-3, IRC- 4 and IRC-5. He proposed looking at them as a group. The proponent found a combination of editorial errors in the 2009 IRC or provisions that would be easily misunderstood. IRC-2 relates to the changes in footings, and another would be problematic in the State of Washington as this has been the process for many years relating to lateral support of footings. The TAG suggested some modifications, and it is expected that further modifications will be needed on IRC-4 through this process. Because these do have to deal with errors and interpretations, the TAG recommended not putting this off until 2012 adoption.

Motion #5

Ray Allshouse moved to forward IRC-2, IRC-3, IRC-4 and IRC-5 into rulemaking. Angie Homola seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Fire Code TAG

Dave Kokot, chair of the Fire Code TAG, is absent today. In his absence, Tim reported on the two items.

Section 903.2.7, Retail Occupancies, Item 4, is new in the 2009 IFC and requires occupancies with display of upholstered furniture to be sprinklered. There were no thresholds included, thus many questions have come up since this adoption. As the effective date approaches, the question is how does this affect the retail that has minimal display of furniture. This issue has been corrected in the 2012 IFC. The new language adds a threshold of 5000 square feet; meaning the establishment would need to exceed 5000 square feet in area before sprinklers would be required. The TAG recommends the Council move this into Emergency Rulemaking to be made effective immediately and be brought up to public hearing to be considered as a permanent rule.

Motion #6

Ray Allhouse made a motion to enter emergency rule making Section 903 for IFC to clarify the threshold for fire sprinklers in certain furniture stores. Motion was seconded by Mark Kulaas. Motion passed unanimously.

One other item under the Fire Code refers to implementing legislation on nightclubs over the past few years. Effective December 1, 2009, all existing nightclubs are required by law be sprinklered. In adopting that rule, there was some concern about construction dates and how they apply. When the date was adopted by the Council it left a gap. The assumption was that as of July 1, 2006, when the State Fire Code was amended, all Group A-2 occupancies, including nightclubs, exceeding an occupancy of 100 were required to be fire sprinklered. The TAG took care of everything built after July 1, 2006. The problem is that under the state law, the definition of nightclub could be under an occupant load of 100, based on a dance floor of 350 square feet. So there is a gap in interpreting this; it may not apply to a new establishment that is under the 100 occupant load. The TAG proposed revising the language in IFC Chapter 46, which refers to existing buildings and IBC 903.2.1.6 and making those sections consistent, and using the explicit language in the statute which says, "...no building can be constructed for, used for, or converted to be used as a nightclub except in accordance with this section." This means the building has to be sprinklered, and this covers the gap.

Motion #7

Mark Kulaas made a motion to move forward with regular rulemaking process on this matter. Mari Hamasaki seconded the motion moving this to public hearing. The motion carried unanimously.

Mechanical Code TAG

Mari Hamasaki reported there were two proposals reviewed. The first, IMC-1, amended the definition of environmental air to be consistent with the 2012 IMC definition. The TAG recommended an additional amendment to add transformer vaults exhaust. Although the amendment was not a unanimous decision by the TAG, the TAG did recommend bringing it forward for public hearing. There was some concern expressed about parking garage exhaust being considered as environmental air, however under the 2012 code, the parking garages are recognized as environmental air.

Motion #8

Mari Hamasaki moved to follow the TAG recommendation to take IMC-1 to public hearing. Ray Allshouse seconded the motion.

Dale Wentworth, opposed the motion. Garage exhaust air being recognized as environmental air is a mistake, due to the poisonous gas component in the air. Allowing this air to be put back into a building is similar to allowing the exhaust from your garage being pulled into your home. He points out there was light attendance at this particular meeting, which may have affected the decision. He raises the question, why would you then need an exhaust fan in the garage. He urged the Council to deny this proposal.

John Cochran asked if this proposal, extended to loading docks. Mari responded she did not believe so. She believes it is for parking garages only.

Call for the Question. The motion carried 8 to 3.

Mari deferred to the Plumbing Code TAG on IMC-2.

Plumbing Code TAG

Dale reported IMC-2 was brought before the Plumbing TAG. This proposal sought to specify that electric water heaters in garages were not required to be elevated. The TAG unanimously recommended the Council disapprove the proposal. The reason is that typical failure of the water heaters is electrical, potentially creating a spark and thereby creating an ignition. There is also concern about consistency with the other electrical installations in garages.

Mari noted the Mechanical TAG unanimously agreed with the Plumbing TAG's recommendation.

Motion #9

Dale Wentworth made a motion to deny this proposal. Mari Hamasaki seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Dale addressed the second proposal regarding the exclusion of strapping of water heaters. The TAG unanimously recommends disapproval of denied this proposal as well. The feeling is that it is necessary to secure the heaters appropriately in elevated areas where these may be installed.

Motion #10

Dale made a motion that the proposal be denied. Angie Homola seconded the motion for disapproval. Motion carried unanimously.

The next proposal addressed concerned ice makers to alleviate the air gaps on the ice makers for fear of it siphoning back in the ice machine. The TAG unanimously recommended disapproval of this proposal, stating it was already adequately covered by the code.

Motion #11

Dale moved to deny this proposal. Ray Allhouse seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The last proposal presented by Dale is a recommendation by the TAG to amend the plumbing code regarding the elevation of water heaters. The proposal was to strike out the language “gas utilization” and the word “appliances” is left intact and then the words “ignition sources” is added to Section 508.14. This was recommended by the TAG to clarify that electric water heaters required elevation in garages.

Motion #12

Dale moved to enter into rulemaking on the amendment to UPC Section 508.14. Ray seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Green Building TAG

Tien Peng reported that there was a conversation after publication of Green Building Code on creating a Green Building Code TAG to examine all Green Building Code standards and codes since there is no real mandate for us to adopt the IGCC. Tien would serve as chair of that TAG.

Tim noted a work plan was included in the mailing to Council. He also notes that the new process to identify membership was used to give a preview of how we anticipate populating TAGs in the future. This new membership would include users, producers, etc. on the TAG. Mari is recommending adding several groups to the general interest group. For example, the Building Commissioning Association (BCA), and the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA).

John encouraged anyone in the audience interested in participating to contact Tim. John feels the IGCC TAG will have a impact on other codes.

Angie asked for when the meetings might be held. Tim stated have not established any schedule yet. We have several people we were hoping to speak with and their availability will affect the schedule.

POSSIBLE RULEMAKING

Handled under a previous item.

INTERPRETATIONS

CO Alarms

Joanne McCaughan, SBCC staff, addressed the interpretation request coming from the City of Seattle, regarding the CO alarms, Section 907.209. Clarification was needed on three issues on where the carbon monoxide alarms would need to be included in Group R-2. The first issue refers to university or college dorm rooms and where they need to be located. The language reads now as outside each separate sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedroom. The intent is to cover all sleeping areas; therefore in this case the alarms would need to be in the room. These would be plug-in units that meet UL-2034. The second issue would be needed in Group R-2 studio or loft apartments where the sleeping area is not separated from the living space. Again, the intent is to cover all sleeping areas by placing the alarm in that same area. The third issue refers to placing the alarms in the corridor outside the studio or loft apartments. However because there is no area outside of the sleeping area, the idea is to place the alarm within the unit. There have been some questions by the public on this issue and the clarification will no doubt be very helpful.

John Cochran asks for questions or comment on this issue.

Motion #13

Mari moved to accept interpretation as given by SBCC staff. Jerry Mueller seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

STAFF REPORT

Tim noted new e-mail and phone numbers will be effective July 1 with the move to General Administration upcoming. The staff, however, will not physically move until sometime in August. There are many details to be worked out now as this move gets closer.

Tim shares with Council information in a bill passed in last legislative session creating significant changes in SBCC's ability to hold meetings in private facilities. The preference of the legislature is to use public spaces in the effort of budget savings. Reimbursement for Council members will also change as well as reimbursement for travel. There is strong encouragement to hold all boards and commission meetings in ways that don't require travel. Staff continues to explore how that will work for us. We have an upcoming public hearing meeting currently scheduled for Spokane. The question is how to hold public hearings if we are not in a physical location. These types of issues will continue to arise in the future. We may need to use electronic means for people to participate without traveling. We continue to work with our constituent organizations to find ways to do business and reduce travel and lodging costs. Tim

adds that we do have a purchase order for new computers which will include the ability to interact by both audio and video.

Angie agrees that electronic meetings are not always possible and she asked that staff pursue methods other than in person meetings.

OTHER BUSINESS

None provided.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:21 p.m.